

## REMARKS

Claims 1-40 are pending in the present application with claims 1, 12, 17, 21, 28, and 37 being independent. Claims 1, 12, 17, 21, 28, and 37 have been amended. No new matter has been added.

In the office action dated February 17, 2010, claims 1-40 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a). Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of the claims consistent with the following remarks.

### Examiner Interview

Applicants thank Examiner Tiv for conducting an interview with applicants' undersigned representative on May 10, 2010. Applicants' representative and the examiner discussed the subject matter of the claims and the cited art. Applicants set forth below a summary of the arguments presented in the interview.

### Rejections under 35 U.S.C §103

In the office action, claims 1-3, 6-8, and 12-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0026500 filed by Kanefsky *et al.* (hereinafter "Kanefsky") in view of a CNN.com webpage dated January 29, 2003 (hereinafter "CNN") in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,259,471 issued to Peters *et al.* (hereinafter "Peters") in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0177454 filed by Karri *et al.* (hereinafter "Karri"), in further view of Japanese Patent Application Publication No. 2001/057599 filed by Hayafune (hereinafter "Hayafune"). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Claim 1 recites "determining, at the content sharing system, that a recipient device is not capable of rendering the content, and responsive thereto *selecting an alternate content link*" and "generating a content share message *comprising the alternate content link*." The office action asserts that Hayafune discloses the equivalent of determining that a recipient device is capable of rendering content. Hayafune discloses a facsimile communication system that stores the

capabilities of a destination facsimile system upon a first transmission so that such capabilities do not have to be determined for destination facsimile system when subsequent facsimile transmissions are sent to the destination facsimile system. As one skilled in the art will appreciate, this does not teach or suggest determining that a recipient device is not capable of rendering content and selecting an alternate content link to be included in a content share message responsive to that determination. Kanefsky, CNN, Peters, and Karri fail to cure this deficiency of Hayafune.

Because Kanefsky, CNN, Peters, Karri, and Hayafune, taken individually or together in any combination, fail to disclose or suggest each and every element of claim 1 and the arrangement of those elements, these references cannot be said to render obvious the subject matter of claim 1. For similar reasons, these references cannot be said to disclose or suggest the subject matter of independent claims 12 and 17. Accordingly, applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1, 12, and 17 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a).

In the office action, claims 21, 22, and 24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2004/0087326 filed by Dunko *et al.* (hereinafter “Dunko”) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,047,327 issued to Tso *et al.* (hereinafter “Tso”) in view Peters, in further view of U.S. Patent No. 6,456,854 issued to Chern *et al.* (hereinafter “Chern”). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Claim 21 recites a multiple gateway “configured for determining that each of the mobile devices is not capable of rendering the content, and responsive thereto ***selecting an alternate content link*** for transmission to each of the mobile devices.” The office action asserts that because Chern’s Abstract discusses display capabilities of web browsing devices, Chern suggests determining that mobile devices are capable of rendering the content. However, Chern merely states that “location information may be sent in a text only format or as text with graphics, depending on the display capabilities of the requesting Web browsing device.” As one skilled in the art will appreciate, this is not the same as a gateway configured for determining that a mobile device is not capable of rendering the content, and selecting an alternate content link for

transmission to the mobile device based on that determination. Dunko, Tso, and Peters fail to cure this deficiency of Chern.

Because Dunko, Tso, Peters, and Chern, taken individually or together in any combination, fail to disclose or suggest each and every element of claim 21 and the arrangement of those elements, these references cannot be said to render obvious the subject matter of claim 21. Accordingly, applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claim 21 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a).

In the office action, claims 28, 29, 33, 34, 36, and 37 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over CNN in view of Dunko and Peters, in further view of Chern. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Claim 28 recites “wherein the content sharing application determines that the recipient device is not capable of rendering the content and responsive thereto *selects an alternate content link* for transmission to the recipient device.” The office action asserts that because Chern’s Abstract discusses display capabilities of web browsing devices, Chern teaches determining that mobile devices are capable of rendering the content. However, Chern merely states that “location information may be sent in a text only format or as text with graphics, depending on the display capabilities of the requesting Web browsing device.” As one skilled in the art will appreciate, this is not the same as a content sharing application that determines that a recipient device is not capable of rendering content and selects an alternate content link for transmission to the recipient device based on that determination. CNN, Dunko, and Peters fail to cure this deficiency of Chern.

Because CNN, Dunko, Peters, and Chern, taken individually or together in any combination, fail to disclose or suggest each and every element of claim 28 and the arrangement of those elements, these references cannot be said to render obvious the subject matter of claim 28. For similar reasons, these references cannot be said to disclose or suggest the subject matter of independent claim 37. Accordingly, applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 28 and 37 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a).

**DOCKET NO.:** CING-0648/887.US  
**Application No.:** 10/821,608  
**Office Action Dated:** February 17, 2010

**PATENT**

Applicants acknowledge that the office action asserts additional grounds for rejection of the claims that are dependent upon claims 1, 12, 17, 21, 28, and 37. However, in view of the traversals set forth with respect to the independent claims, applicants believe that all such dependent claims are in condition for allowance by virtue of their dependence upon independent claim 1, 12, 17, 21, 28, and 37, rendering the rejections of those claims moot. Moreover, applicants submit that the remaining claims recite features that provide a separate basis for patentability. Applicants therefore respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections of all claims that depend from independent claims 1, 12, 17, 21, 28, and 37. Applicants reserve the right to challenge the rejection of any of those dependent claims in any future response that may be forthcoming.

**DOCKET NO.:** CING-0648/887.US  
**Application No.:** 10/821,608  
**Office Action Dated:** February 17, 2010

**PATENT**

### **CONCLUSION**

In view of the foregoing, applicants respectfully submit that this application, including claims 1-40 is in condition for allowance. Favorable consideration and prompt allowance are earnestly solicited.

Should the examiner believe that anything further would be desirable in order to place this application in even better condition for allowance, the examiner is invited to contact applicants' undersigned representative at the telephone number listed below.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any fee deficiency, charge any additional fees, or credit any overpayment of fees, associated with this application in connection with this filing, or any future filing, submitted to the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office during the pendency of this application, to Deposit Account No. 23-3050.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: May 17, 2010

/Aaron F. Bourgeois/  
Aaron F. Bourgeois  
Registration No. 57,936

Woodcock Washburn LLP  
Cira Centre  
2929 Arch Street, 12th Floor  
Philadelphia, PA 19104-2891  
Telephone: (215) 568-3100  
Facsimile: (215) 568-3439